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HISTORICAL PROBLEMS OF ANGLO-SAXON COINAGE—(2)

THE NINTH CENTURY—OFFA TO ALFRED

"On this dark subject of the Anglo-Saxon coinage, we must however confess, that the clouds which have long surrounded it have not yet been removed."
—SHARON TURNER, History of the Anglo-Saxons, 1805

INTRODUCTION

In my Address last year I discussed the introduction of the broad penny coinage in southern England in the reign of Offa, and put forward for reconsideration the view that this coinage was initiated by Offa himself and not by the minor Kentish kings Ecgberht and Heaberht. Arguments were advanced for the earliest of Offa’s coins having been the portrait and non-portrait issues of fine style and delicate engraving—those most closely related to the small mainly unsigned pence commonly called sceattas, which must surely have been re coined when Offa’s series began. Reference was made to the difficulty of reconciling the limited documentary evidence from chronicles and charters with such a numismatic classification based on style, epigraphy and the sequence of moneyers, the inference being that the subject would repay further detailed study, both by numismatists and by historians.

Tonight I want to review the broad penny coinage south of the Humber during the century following the death of Offa in 796. Northumbria, until the fall of York to the Vikings in 867 seems finally to have put an end to it, maintained a coinage of small pence which degenerated from silver sceatta-like pieces to brassy coins commonly known as stycas, and in passing I would refer to the recent publication by Dr. D. M. Metcalf and others of an examination of the composition of a selected sample of this coinage which illustrates its progressive debasement. The introduction of the broad penny into Northumbria by the Danish rulers is a subject which I shall leave until next year.

OFFA TO ÆTHELWULF, 796–c. 840

(a) The Canterbury mint

There can be no reasonable doubt that Offa’s coinage ended with the aptly named “three-line” type, which he also shared with Archbishop Æthelheard of Canterbury. It marked a raising of the weight standard and a further broadening of the flan. This type seems to have

1 I have taken the liberty of rewriting much of the Address as delivered, partly to improve the presentation of key arguments, partly to expand them—this is particularly true of the section on the “lunette” coinage—and partly to take account of valuable comments from Mr. C. E. Blunt and Mr. H. E. Pagan and conversations with Professor Dorothy Whitelock and Mr. P. H. Sawyer. The main points which I set out to make in the verbal Address are, however, unchanged.

been struck at three mints at least: one in Kent, almost certainly at Canterbury; one in Mercia, seemingly at London; and one in East Anglia. After Offa’s death the type was continued for a time although not, so far as we know, in the name of his son Ecgfrith who reigned for less than five months. From the Mercian mint there are coins in the name of Coenwulf, Ecgfrith’s successor as king of Mercia, but at the other mints we find the Mercian supremacy challenged. Eadberht Praen in Kent and Eadwald in East Anglia seem to have defied Coenwulf for perhaps two years, after which all three mints are found striking for him.\(^1\)

At the turn of the century Coenwulf introduced a new type on a slightly smaller flan, bearing his name and title in circumscription around the letter \(M\) for Merciorum. It is commonly referred to as the “tribrach” type from the design found on the reverse of all coins of the true type. It was also struck by Archbishop Æthelheard, his name being coupled with that of the Mercian king as in Offa’s reign. At the royal mint of Canterbury there was a further issue, differing only in minor details, in the name of Coenwulf’s brother Cuthred, king of Kent. This was followed at that mint by a portrait issue, bearing the name sometimes of Cuthred, sometimes of Coenwulf, and having for the reverse design a cross with wedges in the angles. For the remainder of Coenwulf’s reign—he died in 821—the coinage always bore a royal portrait.

Cuthred died in 807, evidently during the currency of the “cross and wedges” type, and the coinage in the name of a king of Kent lapsed for some fifteen years. It is not clear whether Cuthred had the exclusive use of the Canterbury mint, taking it over from Coenwulf during the currency of “tribrach” and introducing the new portrait coinage, or whether the two kings shared the mint. The numismatic evidence is on balance slightly in favour of Coenwulf’s “cross and wedges” coins being later than Cuthred’s, and thus, if anything, seems to point to consecutive rather than concurrent minting.

After a short period of experiment, the royal mint at Canterbury followed “cross and wedges” with a new type to which the descriptive name “pincer cross” has been given. This was struck on a broadened flan, and a date of c. 810 for its introduction has been suggested. In the meantime a portrait coinage in the name of Archbishop Wulfred, who succeeded Æthelheard in 807, had begun on a small flan, but was subsequently changed to the broader flan, doubtless at the time of the introduction of ‘pincer cross’. The identification of the Canterbury mint on the earliest coins of Wulfred, and in monogram form on later coins, gives us a clear indication that the royal series we have been discussing is to be attributed to Canterbury, for the two series are closely related in style and epigraphy. The archbishop seems to have begun with one moneyer, for none was named on the earliest coins, but with the broadening of the flan we find two moneyers’ names appearing. On the other hand the complement of moneyers striking in the king’s name at Canterbury was evidently six, and this number was maintained unaltered until 825 at least, and perhaps until early in the reign of Æthelwulf. On the evidence of Grately one of these six moneyers might well have been the abbot’s, and it may be significant that, at about the time Archbishop Wulfred’s coinage began, the moneyer Sigeberht is found with a reverse design apparently representing the Triple Aura.

It is not difficult to trace the Canterbury series through from 810 until the fall of Kent to Ecgberht of Wessex in 825, by which time the identity of the mint is firmly established on the coins themselves, and this was done in a paper by C. E. Blunt, B. H. I. H. Stewart and myself in \(BNJ\) XXXII.\(^2\) In the process certain conclusions of fundamental importance for the political

---

\(^1\) See “The Coinage of southern England, 796–840”, by C. E. Blunt, C. S. S. Lyon and B. H. I. H. Stewart, in \(BNJ\) XXXII (1963), where the period from 796 to 825 is very fully illustrated.

\(^2\) See note 1.
history of the period were drawn. The first was that relatively few of the surviving coins of Ceolwulf I, who succeeded his brother Coenwulf on the latter’s death in 821, were struck at Canterbury, and that for the greater part of his two-year reign in Mercia both Canterbury mints adopted an equivocal position, issuing coins bearing a royal and archiepiscopal portrait respectively but with no king’s or archbishop’s name. (The fact that this happened at both mints confirms that there was a crisis of authority, for the archbishop had previously obtained his minting rights from the Mercian king.) Indeed of the six Canterbury moneyers at the royal mint only two are known to have struck in Ceolwulf’s name, and the number of surviving coins is sufficient to enable some significance to be attached to this. As these two moneyers also struck the ‘anonymous’ issue the question arises of whether their acknowledgement of Ceolwulf preceded or followed their period of equivocation. This question cannot be answered with any degree of certainty, although there are signs that the Ceolwulf coins may be later than the ‘anonymous’ group, for whereas Coenwulf’s coinage had for many years been exclusively based on a portrait on the obverse, and the ‘anonymous’ coinage followed this tradition, some of the coins of Ceolwulf bear no portrait—a situation that was to recur at Canterbury in subsequent reigns. Moreover Ceolwulf’s two moneyers are not found striking the second phase of the ‘anonymous’ issue, in which the diademed head of the first phase gave way to a bonneted head.

The second conclusion drawn by Blunt, Lyon and Stewart was that Beornwulf, who obtained the Mercian crown on Ceolwulf’s expulsion in 823, and is stated by Stenton to have been the dominant figure in southern England as late as the summer of 825, did not have (or did not exercise?) the right of coinage at Canterbury. Instead the coinage was once again in the name of a king of Kent, this time Baldred (here generally spelt Beldred), who was put to flight, we are told in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, by Ecgberht of Wessex in 825. He can be assumed to have emerged from the weakening of Mercian power, for there is no earlier mention of him in documents. His portrait coins generally bore a bonneted head similar to that on ‘anonymous’ coins of the second phase and on the reverse—as with the corresponding coins of Archbishop Wulfred—the contraction DRVR CITS for Dorovernia Civitas. On the ‘anonymous’ coins this inscription had occurred in full, though with a B instead of the V in the Latin form of Canterbury. The bonneted portrait was continued for a time by Ecgberht, but without the DRVR CITS reverse: instead the reverse design varied from moneyer to moneyer, as on the non-portrait coins of Ceolwulf, Baldred and Ecgberht himself. The relationship between the portrait and non-portrait issues of this period is not clear.

Perhaps as early as 828, Ecgberht introduced a standard portrait type bearing a monogram of Dorob C on the reverse (Pl. 22, 2). It appears to have replaced the initial portrait and non-portrait issues (e.g. Pl. 22, 1), and was not superseded at the royal mint until after Ecgberht’s death in 838. It was shared, though apparently on a small scale, by Archbishop Wulfred (Pl. 22, 6), who died in 832, and by Ceolnoth, who was appointed archbishop in the following year after the short and apparently coinless episcopacy of Feologeld. The coinage of Ecgberht was very fully discussed ten years ago by C. E. Blunt in his definitive paper in BNJ XXVIII entitled ‘The coinage of Ecgbeorht, King of Wessex 802–39’, and the Canterbury issues are those of his Groups 1, 2 and 3.

There can be little doubt that the first Canterbury coinage of Æthelwulf, Ecgberht’s son, was the non-portrait type which incorporates the ethnic Saxoniorum on the reverse and depicts a ‘cross and wedges’ on the obverse (Pl. 22, 3). Only one moneyer is common to this type and to Ecgberht’s Dorob C issue, and Mr. Blunt has suggested that minting towards the
end of the latter may have been on a small scale. An alternative possibility to be considered is that there may actually have been an interruption, perhaps of a few years, in the Canterbury coinage. But before we discuss this question further it is necessary to look at the other Kentish mint of the period, Rochester.

(b) The mint of Rochester and the Middle Temple hoard

A mint at Rochester first becomes evident during the reign of Ceolwulf I, for which two coins of crude style are known bearing the name *Dorobrebia*.1 They are perhaps to be associated with a single moneyer working for the bishop, for coins similar in style exist bearing moneyers’ names but no mint signature and these are presumably of moneyers working for a different authority—that is to say, the king. A century later Athelstan legislated for Rochester to have two moneyers for the king and one for the bishop, and it may be significant that the complement of moneyers named on the coins of the early ninth century mint seems to have been two. The origin of the mint has been traced back by Blunt, Lyon and Stewart as far as the middle of the reign of Coenwulf.

Rochester’s issues for Ceolwulf seem to have been prolific in comparison with those of Canterbury. The king’s name is invariably spelt *Ciol...* against *ceol...* at Canterbury. The moneyers were apparently in no doubt about his authority, for there is nothing to correspond with the Canterbury anonymous issue. When the mint acknowledged Baldred—presumably on Ceolwulf’s deposition in 823—he was never styled *rex Cant,* but simply *rex* or *rex Ḥ,* seemingly for *Hrofesceastre.* The mint worked for Ecgberht after he conquered Kent in 825, and its output for him is reflected in the coins of Group 4 of Mr. Blunt’s classification. Up to this point its obverse types had always used the king’s head or bust, but after an early issue for Ecgberht depicting a very primitive head (Pl. 22, 10) it then appears to have adopted a series of non-portrait types (Pl. 22, 11-12). Again there is a difference in spelling, *viz Ecgbeorht* against the Canterbury *Ecgbeart.*

A second portrait issue for Ecgberht is found bearing an inscription which is an abbreviation of *Sanctus Andreas Apostolus* (Pl. 22, 15-17). There is no moneyer’s name, and it can scarcely be doubted that this was an issue of the bishop’s moneyer. Three, if not four, of the five known specimens are from the Middle Temple hoard. This is the exceptionally interesting hoard which was presented to the British Museum in 1893 by Sir A. W. Franks, and which is recorded in J. D. A. Thompson’s *Inventory* under “Unknown Site No. 2”. It contained one late coin of Offa and one of Eadberht Praen, but otherwise consisted of coins of the first forty years of the ninth century. A date of c. 841-2 has been suggested for its deposition—that is, two or three years after Æthelwulf succeeded his father Ecgberht as king of Wessex.

As can be seen from Table 1, the 28 coins of Æthelwulf in the hoard are remarkable in that all but two appear to be attributable to Rochester. Twenty-two are of a portrait issue by two moneyers, one at least of whom had previously struck for Ecgberht. They represent a considerable variety of designs and display a deterioration in style which suggests a duration of several years (Pl. 22, 13, 14, 18). The king’s name invariably begins *Æ* (with the curve, not the upright, of the thorn crossed).

For a stylistic affinity with these portrait coins we have to look to the St. Andrew coins of Ecgberht. Now bearing in mind the number of Æthelwulf’s coins in the Middle Temple hoard

---

1 The identification of this mint signature seems first to have been made by the Rev. D. H. Haigh in his paper “Miscellaneous notes on the old English coinage” (NC 1889). It was then ignored until Mr. Blunt revived it in a note in *BNJ* XXVIII, p. 406.
TABLE I

Canterbury, Rochester and Winchester moneyers of Ecgberht and Æthelwulf up to c. 862 and of the contemporary issues of Archbishops Wulfred and Ceolnoth, showing their representation in the Middle Temple (1893) and Dorking (1817) hoards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>EMC Types</th>
<th>Modern Grouping</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Moneyers known</th>
<th>Number of coins recorded in Middle Temple (Archaeologia NC 1894)</th>
<th>Number of coins recorded in Dorking (Archaeologia XIX)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>iv, vii, ix, -</td>
<td>Blunt 1</td>
<td>Bonneted head/various (Pl. 22, 1)</td>
<td>Diormod^m, Sigestef^m, Swefheard^m, Tidbearht^m, Werheard^m</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>x-xii, xv, xvi</td>
<td>Blunt 2</td>
<td>Cross, etc./various (Pl. 22, 1)</td>
<td>Diormod^m, Oba^m, Sigestef^m, Swefheard^m, Tidbearht^m, Werheard^m</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, C?</td>
<td>i, ia</td>
<td>Blunt 3</td>
<td>Bust/Dorob C monogram (Pl. 22, 2)</td>
<td>Diormod^m, Oba^m, Swefheard^m, Tidbearht^m, Biornmod^e, Bosal, Dealia, Deibus, Duding, Osmund^e, Tiliwine</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CANTERBURY, ÆTHELWULF

| D        | v                  | Dolley & Skaare     | Cross-and-wedges/ Saxiorum (Pl. 22, 3)            | Osmund^e, Diar^o, Herebeald, Manna, Torchtwald        | 2                                                               | 28                                                      |
| D1, E    | vi, vii, xi-xiv    | Dolley & Skaare     | Bust/crosslet etc. (Pl. 22, 4)                    | Osmund^e, Diar^o, Herebeald, Manna, Deiheah, Eanmund, Hurnbearht^o, Liabe^o | —                                                                | 44 (crosslet)                                          |
| E        | i (part), ia, ii, iii | Dolley & Skaare     | DORBE/CANT, CANT/DORBE- and variations (Pl. 22, 5) | Osmund^e, Diar^o (var.), Herebeald, Manna, Deiheah, Eanmund, Hurnbearht^o, Falgmund, Ethelmund, Hebeoa^e (var.) | —                                                                | 26                                                      |
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| CANTERBURY, ABP. WULFRED | Blunt, Lyon and Stewart VII | Bust/Dorob C monogram | Sweheardswefhearded | 1 | — | 1 | — |
| CANTERBURY, ABP. CEOLNOTH | — | — | Biornmodb, Wunhere | 1 | — | 1 | — |
| B, C? | — | — | Biornmodb, Wunhere | 9 | 16 |
| C?, D | — | — | Biornmodb, Wunhere, Sweheard | — | 14 |
| E | — | — | Anonymous moneyer, Lil, Biarnredob, Diela | — | 2 |
| E (late) | — | — | Various non-portrait/various (Pl. 22, 11-12) | — | — |
| ROCHESTER, REXERCHET | Blunt 4 | Bust or head/various (Pl. 22, 10) | Dununb,c,d, Ethelmodb | 1 | 1 |
| A | — | — | Various non-portrait/various (Pl. 22, 11-12) | 5 | 1 |
| B, C? | — | — | Anonymous moneyer (ecclesiastical issue) | 3 | — |
| B, C? | — | — | Anonymous moneyer (ecclesiastical issue) | 9 | 2 |
| ROCHESTER, ETHELWULF | Blunt 'Rochester' | Bust/ses Andreas (Pl. 22, 16-17) | Beagmundo, Dunb,c,d, Wilheah | 22 | 3 |
| C | — | — | Beagmundo, Dunb,c,d, Wilheah | 22 | 3 |
| D | — | — | Beagmundo, Dunb,c,d, Wilheah, Bridb, Ethelhereb, Manocb, Wenefheard | — | 16 |
| D | — | — | Anonymous moneyer (ecclesiastical issue?) | 4 | 6 |
### Number of coins recorded in Middle Dorking Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>BMC Types</th>
<th>Modern Grouping</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Moneys known</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D/E</td>
<td>viii, xv, xvi</td>
<td>Dolley &amp; Skaare Second Coinage (B2)</td>
<td>'Berhtwulf' portrait/ various (Pl. 22, 24)</td>
<td>Ethelhæ, Manninc, Biarnnoth</td>
<td>— 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>i (part)</td>
<td>Dolley &amp; Skaare Third Coinage (B 2)</td>
<td>DOR(^{-}) or DORIB/CANT (Pl. 22, 26)</td>
<td>Wilhæ, Bridd, Ethelhæ, Manninc, Wilheard, Biarnnoth</td>
<td>— 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WINCHESTER, ECGBERHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>BMC Types</th>
<th>Modern Grouping</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Moneys known</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-C?</td>
<td>xviii</td>
<td>Blunt 'Winchester'</td>
<td>Saxon/cross</td>
<td>Beornheard, Bosa, Ia, Tideman, Tired</td>
<td>3 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C?</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>Blunt 'Winchester'</td>
<td>Saxoniortum/cross</td>
<td>Eanwald(^{a})</td>
<td>1 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WINCHESTER, ÆTHELWULF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>BMC Types</th>
<th>Modern Grouping</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Moneys known</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Saxon/cross and wedges</td>
<td>Eanwald(^{c})</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dolley and Skaare record one additional coin of Æthelwulf, BMC xiii, two of BMC xviii, one of BMC xix, two of BMC xx, which were presented to the British Museum by Taylor Combe's widow.

\(a\) = also a moneyer of Æthelwulf  
\(b\) = also a moneyer of Baldred  
\(c\) = also a moneyer of Archbishop Ceolnoth  
\(d\) = also a moneyer of Berhtwulf  
\(e\) = also a moneyer of Egberht  
\(m\) = also a moneyer of Coenwulf, the 'Anonymous' issue and Baldred  
\(o\) = also a moneyer in the 'open cross' type (BMC xvii of Æthelwulf, or the corresponding issue of Archbishop Ceolnoth)  
\(w\) = also a moneyer of Archbishop Wulfred
it is a matter for some surprise that no similar issue in his name is known, and one can reason-
ably doubt whether such an issue was ever made. I think it may not be without significance
that the dies for one of the Ecgberht St. Andrew pieces and for an Æthelwulf coin of the
moneyer Beagmund are of identical design, and are so close in every common detail as to have
been cut not only by the same hand, but perhaps even as part of a single consignment of dies
(Pl. 22, 13, 16). There is, too, a degree of parallelism in the two series which makes me wonder
if they could have overlapped, at least to some extent. This, however, could only have
happened if Æthelwulf, who is recorded as having been sub-king of Kent during his father's
last years, had had the services of the royal moneyers at Rochester while the bishop's entitle-
ment to a moneyer continued to be derived from Ecgberht. But as there is no numismatic
evidence for Æthelwulf having in turn conceded such a right to his son Athelstan, who
came sub-king of Kent on Æthelwulf's accession to the throne of Wessex, the idea of such
dichotomy cannot immediately commend itself.

Nevertheless there are several other features of the coinage at the end of Ecgberht's reign
and the beginning of Æthelwulf's for which some explanation is necessary. Most of these
concern the use of the rex Saxoniorum title. Why, for example, did Æthelwulf apparently
close down a mint outside Kent—perhaps at Winchester—early in his reign? That
mint had struck non-portrait coins for Ecgberht on which the rex Saxoniorum title
was displayed, generally with the ethnic in a monogram. Why, too, did Æthelwulf in-
troduce, for his first issue at Canterbury, a type which copied one form in which his father
had proclaimed that title at this other mint? Is there a connexion between the number of
Rochester portrait coins of Æthelwulf in the Middle Temple hoard, the presence of only two
Canterbury coins of the rex Saxoniorum type, and the fact that only one Canterbury moneyer
of Ecgberht is known for this type?

My own impression from a consideration of this hoard and the later hoard from Dorking is
that the Rochester portrait issue represented in the Middle Temple hoard had run its course,
or virtually so, by the date of deposition of the hoard, but that the rex Saxoniorum issue had
only just begun at Canterbury. If this is right, and if there was no break in the Canterbury
coinage, we must again face the problem of Æthelwulf having had the use of the royal mint at
Rochester in Ecgberht's lifetime, but this time with the added complication that Ecgberht
retained the Canterbury mint. If there was a break in minting at the royal mint at Canterbury
and this was confined to the last years of Ecgberht's reign, the same problem arises, except that
the Canterbury mint may have been inactive at the time. If, however, the break began after
Ecgberht's death, or continued beyond it, the case for Æthelwulf having used the royal mint
of Rochester in his father's lifetime must fall back on the relationship between his portrait
coins and the St. Andrew coinage of the ecclesiastical mint.

There is a further piece of evidence from the Middle Temple hoard which has a bearing on
this question. It concerns the archiepiscopal coinage of Canterbury. The hoard contained two
of the four ecclesiastical coins known with Ecgberht's form of the Dorob C monogram. One of
these was the unique coin of this type of Archbishop Wulfred, who died in 832 (Pl. 22, 6): the
other was of Ceolnoth, who received the pallium in 832, some five years before Ecgberht's
death. But there were also present in the hoard nine coins of Ceolnoth bearing the monogram
in much the same form as Wulfred had used in Coenwulf's reign, and they display considerable

1 Compare, for example, the portraits on Pl. 22, nos. 14 and 17, and the form of the initial cross and
the letter A on the reverse of each coin. Note also the use of an angular G in Ecgberht on nos. 15–17
and in Beagmund on nos. 13 and 18, as against a rounded G in Ecgberht on nos. 10–12.
variation and degeneration of style, both in the portrait—which at first shows continuity with that on the Dorob C coins—and in the form of the monogram. The introduction of this “second monogram” type (Pl. 22, 7) may therefore have antedated Æthelwulf’s Saxoniorum type by two or three years. If it can be regarded as marking the end of the Dorob C issue as a whole—and it would have represented a break with the practice established over the previous fifteen years if the type had been superseded at the archbishop’s mint while it was still being used by the royal moneyers—it strengthens the argument that there was an interruption at the royal mint before the Saxoniorum issue began. Bearing in mind the rarity of Dorob C coins of Ceolnoth it is more probable that such an interruption would have preceded rather than followed Ecgberht’s death.

But the hypothesis that there was a discontinuity in the royal coinage at a time when the archbishop’s mint continued to be active cannot be put forward without other reservations. If there was a break towards the end of Ecgberht’s reign a possible explanation is that the royal moneyers deliberately refrained from minting for Ecgberht. We should not rule this out especially in view of the evidence, however tenuous, that at Rochester the royal moneyers may actually have worked for Æthelwulf while the bishop continued to acknowledge that his minting rights were derived from Ecgberht. Nevertheless there may prove to be historical difficulties in the way of accepting this evidence. Numismatically, too, one wonders why, if the royal mint was inactive, Ceolnoth should have thought it necessary to change the reverse type of his coins. If we could discount the evidence for a break in the royal coinage, and regard “second monogram” as Ceolnoth’s answer to Æthelwulf’s Saxoniorum type—for the archbishop could not possibly have adopted the latter—we could perhaps seek to explain the inclusion of only two Saxoniorum coins in the Middle Temple hoard against nine of “second monogram” as no more than a rather remarkable statistical quirk.

Such a quirk appears to underlie the presence of four non-portrait coins of Æthelwulf with the cross and wedges design on the obverse but with the extended title rex occidentalium Saxoniorum taking up the whole of the reverse (Pl. 22, 20). There is no moneyer’s name. This issue is closely paralleled in style and in obverse design by coins bearing the names of the Rochester moneyers of the portrait issue, but no ethnic: none of these was in the hoard. (See Pl. 22, 19, which is however of a new moneyer.) The lettering of both issues is quite different from that used on the portrait coins, and the king’s name is initially spelt AEB . . . . . with the cross of the thorn on the upright. It seems likely that here we have the Rochester equivalents of the Canterbury Saxoniorum type, and that the rex occidentalium Saxoniorum coins are from the bishop’s moneyer. If so, this is the last distinctive ecclesiastical issue of Rochester. Was there no longer a need for any distinction, as there may have been at the time of the St. Andrew coins, or was it simply that the occidentalium Saxoniorum issue ceased with Bishop Beornmod’s death c. 843 and was not resumed under his successor? I make no apology for dwelling at some length on a coinage which is linked with St. Andrew, for it seems entirely appropriate to do so on such an occasion. Moreover, there is clearly a need for a closer study of the issues of this transitional period. As the Middle Temple hoard demonstrates, it is the recent identification of both royal and ecclesiastical issues of the

---

1 There are two forms of the “second monogram”, the more intricate of which (cf. BMC I, Pl. XIII, 12) appears to be the earlier, since the portrait which usually accompanies it has chevron drapery similar to that found on the obverse of Dorob C coins (e.g. Montagu 317). The other form of the monogram (cf. BMC I, Pl. XIII, 6) is generally associated with a portrait showing square shoulders and with lettering which includes the broken letter D typical of the Saxoniorum issue. Both forms of the monogram were present in the Middle Temple hoard.
Rochester mint in Æthelberht’s reign, and their continuation into Æthelwulf’s, that have made such a study necessary. It will need to include an examination, with historians, of the status of sub-kings of Kent, not only in the middle of the ninth century but also during the reigns of Offa and Coenwulf, before a considered judgment can be formed.

**TABLE 2**

Summary of the coins from Canterbury and Rochester in the names of Ecgberht and Æthelwulf (excluding the “open cross” type) in the Middle Temple and Dorking hoards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rochester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Dorking</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Dorking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecgberht</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelwulf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periods A-C</td>
<td>(Pre-Saxoniorum)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periods D-E</td>
<td>(Saxoniorum and parallel or later issues)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrangement by periods (see Table 1), by grouping the early portrait coinage of Æthelwulf at Rochester with the coinage of Ecgberht, produces a more consistent pattern than the arrangement by reigns. This may indicate (1) that the Canterbury mint, but not that at Rochester, was inactive early in Æthelwulf’s reign; or (2) that the Canterbury mint was inactive late in Ecgberht’s reign at a time when the Rochester mint was already striking coins for Æthelwulf (as sub-king of Kent). The evidence of the ten coins of Archbishop Ceolnoth in Middle Temple seems to support the latter theory, but suggests that the archiepiscopal mint remained active (see text).

(c) The mints in East Anglia and at London

The kingdom of East Anglia is historically obscure from the time that its king, Æthelberht, was beheaded by Offa in 794 until the well-known martyrdom of King (later Saint) Edmund by the Danes in 869. A few portrait coins of Æthelberht are known, by a moneyer Lul, and they depict the Roman republican design of a wolf and twins. Lul subsequently struck Offa’s “three line” type, as did another moneyer distinguished by Mr. Blunt as working at an East Anglian mint. Two more moneyers who struck slightly earlier types for Offa seem also to have been working in East Anglia.

After Offa’s death we find three moneyers striking the three-line type in the name of a King Eadwalde. One of these was Lul. It seems that Eadwalde was the East Anglian parallel of the Kentish Eadberht Praen, and that, like Eadberht, he was overthrown by Coenwulf before the turn of the century. From this time the mint or mints in East Anglia worked for the Mercian kings, and it is only from East Anglia that we have coins of Beornwulf and

---

1 The date given by Professor Whitelock on p. 31 of English Historical Documents, vol. I.
Ludicia who ruled Mercia for two years each after Ceolwulf's expulsion in 823. From the continuity of moneysers and on grounds of style it is clear that the independence of East Anglia was resumed c. 827 in the person of an unknown King Athelstan. The mint began with a portrait issue, but soon turned over to the non-portrait coinage that characterised East Anglia until the death of Edmund and beyond. Between these two kings the evidence of the coins shows that a King Æthelweard reigned, but it seems from the Middle Temple hoard that Athelstan was still ruling at the end of Ecgberht's reign in Wessex. No new types of Athelstan occur in later hoards, and it seems reasonable to assume that Æthelweard succeeded him early in the 840's.

Research is needed into the coinage of Athelstan and his successors to determine the order of the non-portrait types and to clarify whether one mint or two were at work. This research will also need to examine the transition from Mercian to East Anglian control, and consider the implications of the apparent reduction in the number of moneysers working in East Anglia from seven in Ceolwulf's reign to three at the beginning of Athelstan's.

The paper by Blunt, Lyon and Stewart on the coinage of southern England in this period pointed to a residue of moneysers working for the Mercian kings who, because they can be traced through to Wiglaf, must surely have operated at a mint inside Mercia. The obvious location for such a mint is London. It was evidently working late in Offa's reign, and was then used by Coenwulf and Ceolwulf (whose name is spelt with an i, as at Rochester, while the East Anglian moneysers follow Canterbury and use ø). There is no sign of the Mercian mint in the reigns of Beornwulf and Ludicia, but it reappears under Wiglaf. When Ecgberht conquered Mercia in 829 he issued some coins bearing the name of London—where his name was spelt Ecgberht—and others with the name of a moneyer, Redmudh. Wiglaf recovered his kingdom in 830, and coins bearing his name coupled with that of Redmudh are probably to be attributed to his second reign. But for most of the ten years of that reign Mercia seems not to have minted any coins, and we have to look to his successor, Berhtwulf, for a resumption of the series.

ÆTHELWULF, CŒLNOTH AND BERHTWULF, c. 840–c. 852

(a) Æthelwulf

It is not difficult to follow the broad outline of Æthelwulf's coinage after the deposition of the Middle Temple hoard. If we except the unique coin, perhaps of Winchester, which provides evidence for the continuance for a short time of a special Saxoniorum monogram type begun by Ecgberht, the history is that of the two mints of Canterbury and Rochester, at least until after Berhtwulf's flight in 851. R. H. M. Dolley and K. Skaare, in their paper in Anglo Saxon Coins entitled "The Coinage of Æthelwulf, King of the West Saxons, 839–58", have described the coinage in some detail but their analysis needs to be modified somewhat in the light of subsequent research into previous coinages, for their two officiae can now be identified as the mints of Canterbury and Rochester.

At Canterbury there was, of course, the initial Saxoniorum issue (Pl. 22, 3). This was followed by a range of portrait types (e.g. Pl. 22, 4) and by the non-portrait DORÆ/B/CANT type (Pl. 22, 5), so called because of the abbreviations which form the central designs. Finally there was a new portrait issue which continued for the greater part of Æthelberht's reign and which bore the moneyer's name on the limbs and between the angles of an open cross (Pl. 23, 8). At Rochester, leaving aside the early portrait coins which I have already discussed,
the series began with the non-portrait cross-and-wedges type (Pl. 22, 19, 21). This gave way to **DOR~B~/CANT** (Pl. 22, 26)—the first time we have a standard type at both Rochester and Canterbury, for **DOR~B~** is as good an abbreviation for *Dorobrevia* as for *Dorobernia*—and a limited group of portrait coins (Pl. 22, 24), and finally, again as at Canterbury, to the ‘open cross’ type. Initially this last type seems to have been from dies prepared locally, but very soon the old Rochester style of die-cutting disappeared. Since the moneyers remained it may be assumed that further dies were obtained from Canterbury, but it becomes impossible to distinguish the coins of the two mints.

The main problem is to place the middle portrait coins at Canterbury and at Rochester relative to the **DOR~B~/CANT** issue. Dolley and Skaare put them earlier than **DOR~B~/CANT**, but the range of types and lettering at Canterbury and the development of the portrait make me think that the two series may have overlapped there. Moreover, only one of the eight known moneyers of the Canterbury portrait series is not also known for the less extensive **DOR~B~/CANT** issue (see Table 1). At Rochester, on the other hand, the middle portrait issue probably antedates **DOR~B~/CANT**, since the reverse types are identical with those found at the end of the ‘cross-and-wedges’ issue: these portrait coins are also closely related to those of Berhtwulf of Mercia.

The resolution of this problem is of greater numismatic than historical importance and it would be presumptuous of me to take the subject any further, particularly in the absence of a detailed published reconstruction of the Sevington hoard of 1834 which appears to have been buried shortly before the ‘open cross’ issue began. Dolley and Skarre’s conclusion that the **DOR~B~/CANT** issue was interrupted by the Danish incursion of 851 may well be correct, for the ‘open cross’ type seems to have run for several years during Æthelwulf’s lifetime. Of course the earlier we can place the beginning of the ‘open cross’ issue the more likely that a reassessment of the dates of the Northumbrian kings might enable us to reattribute to Eanred of Northumbria the unique penny from the Trewhiddle hoard (Pl. 23, 7), which from its style must have been struck at about the time that issue began.³

(b) *Ceolnoth*

Meanwhile the coinage of Archbishop Ceolnoth had been developing on parallel lines to Æthelwulf’s Canterbury coinage. In 840 it is probable, as I have already indicated, that his coins with the degraded monogram based on his predecessor’s early coinage were already in issue (Pl. 22, 7). Perhaps at the time the *Saxoniorum* type ceased, the Canterbury monogram gave way to a series of designs based on the *Chi-Rho* (Pl. 22, 8). This seems to parallel the early portrait coins of the royal moneyers.

After this group—perhaps in 851—there appears to have been a break, for the next issues feature a change in the spelling of the archbishop’s name from *CIALNOB* to *CEOLNOB*, and two or perhaps three new moneyers who sign their coins with the mint signature (Pl. 23, 1). One or two specimens are known with no moneyer’s name, as though the mint was reduced for a time to a complement of one moneyer (Pl. 22, 9). The portrait on this group of coins closely resembles that on the final group of Æthelwulf’s reign, when Ceolnoth adopted the royal type of the ‘open cross’ (Pl. 23, 2).

¹ As Haigh pointed out in his paper in *NC* 1869 already referred to.
² See, for example, Fitzwilliam Sylloge no. 529, by the Rochester moneyer Ethelere. I have two specimens of similar style in my own cabinet by a moneyer Ethelmod, who is not known for earlier issues.
(c) Berhtwulf

The resumption of the Mercian series by Berhtwulf presents us with a major historical problem, for there can be no doubt that many of his dies were prepared by the engraver who also cut the dies for one of Æthelwulf's mints. Brooke thought this was the Canterbury mint, but it now seems more likely to have been Rochester.

The most detailed account of this coinage is to be found in J. J. North's article, "The Coinage of Berhtwulf of Mercia (840–852)" which appeared in SNC, LXIX (October 1961). North divides the main portrait coinage into two groups which he regards as consecutive. They are stylistically quite distinctive and seem to be the work of two engravers. One of these, as has been mentioned, also serviced the West Saxon mint at Rochester (Pl. 22, 22–23, 25), but the other worked exclusively for Berhtwulf and was more original in his treatment of the portrait and in his reverse designs (Pl. 22, 27). Of the ten moneyers known to have struck this coinage for Berhtwulf, three received dies from both engravers. Two others are known from dies of Æthelwulf's engraver only, and one of these (Brid) was a moneyer of Æthelwulf in the "cross and wedges" issue and also in Dor–B/cant (Pl. 22, 19, 23, 26). Five moneyers are known only from dies of the second engraver, and two of them (Eanred and Wine) are perhaps to be equated with relatively early moneyers of Burgred of the same names. The fact that one of Berhtwulf's moneyers, Liaba, shared the name of a Canterbury moneyer of Æthelwulf is probably coincidence, for there is no stylistic resemblance between their coins.

If the portrait coins in Berhtwulf's name were struck at Rochester it is tempting to look on them as the successors of the apparently episcopal Occidentium Saxontorun issue. This, however, would be to go far beyond the documentary evidence linking Berhtwulf and the see of Rochester, namely his confirmation c. 844–5 of an eighth century charter which gave the bishop the right to a free ship at the port of London. It is scarcely conceivable that the bishop could have obtained his minting rights from Berhtwulf rather than Æthelwulf. Moreover he seems to have been entitled only to a single moneyer, but the coinage in Berhtwulf's name must have been struck by several moneyers at any one time. The presence on some of these coins of the alpha-omega monogram, which had occurred on the St. Andrew coins of Ecgberht, cannot be given undue significance because it is also found on coins of Æthelwulf's moneyers, and if it has any meaning in this context it denotes, at best, the mint of Rochester.

Does the sharing by Berhtwulf of the engraver who cut Æthelwulf's dies for the Rochester mint necessarily force us to the conclusion that Berhtwulf's coins were struck there? The charter already mentioned makes such a conclusion less improbable than it might otherwise have been, and there is, too, an interesting suggestion that Berhtwulf may have confirmed that charter at a royal residence just outside the city. Nevertheless Rochester was in a kingdom subject to West Saxon rule, and it is disconcerting to find ten moneyers for Berhtwulf's portrait coinage against only eight for the Rochester coins of Æthelwulf during Berhtwulf's reign. The Dorking hoard, as listed by Taylor Combe, contained 23 coins of Berhtwulf against 43 Rochester and 117 Canterbury coins of Æthelwulf of types earlier than "open cross" (see Table 1).

Alternative possibilities are that Æthelwulf's engraver at Rochester supplied dies to a Mercian mint at London, or that a Mercian engraver sent dies to Æthelwulf's mint at

1 No. 66 (pp. 451–453) in English Historical Documents I. I am grateful to Mr. H. E. Pagan for drawing my attention to this reference.

2 Professor Whitelock, in a footnote to her commentary on this charter in EHD, says "Gordon Ward, Arch Cantiana XLVII, pp. 117–125, suggests that [in vico regali Werburgewic] refers to Hoo, Kent, which was dedicated to St. Werburgh." But this was only one of a number of similar foundations, others of which were in Mercia.
Rochester. Neither is attractive, since there appears to be no precedent for one kingdom sending to another for its dies. Nor does either alternative resolve the problem of the shared moneyer, Brid. He must surely have worked at a Kentish mint, for he struck the DOR-B~CANT type for Æthelwulf, and he may therefore provide the evidence that Berhtwulf had minting rights in that kingdom.

The tradition of London engraving did not involve the use of punches. Berhtwulf’s portrait dies were cut with punches, but there is a unique non-portrait coin of a moneyer Tatel from dies for which they were not employed. Brooke suggested London as the mint for this piece, and I see no reason to dispute his attribution.¹ Tatel is otherwise known as an early moneyer of Burgred, who obtained the Mercian kingdom after Berhtwulf fled the country in 851, and his coin for the latter therefore seems more likely to have been struck late rather than early in the reign.

The link between Berhtwulf and Æthelwulf is strengthened by the unique coin, published in the supplement to Brooke, on which an apparently regular portrait die of the Mercian king is coupled with an irregular cross-and-wedges obverse of Æthelwulf (Pl. 22, 22). The authors of the supplement comment that “on the analogy of the coins of the Archbishops of Canterbury this suggests that at the time, or in the area, in which it was struck, Berhtwulf was subject to the suzerainty of Wessex.” Perhaps, in its reference to area, this is true of his portrait coinage as a whole.²

ÆTHELWULF TO ALFRED, c. 852–c. 886

(a) The ‘open cross’ type, c. 852–c. 862/4

For the last years of Æthelwulf’s reign and much of his son Æthelberht’s, the coinage of south-eastern England was of the uniform type to which I have already referred as the ‘open cross’ issue (Pl. 23, 2, 8). It probably began soon after Berhtwulf’s expulsion from Mercia, and may have had a duration as long as ten years. A large number of moneyers is known—no fewer than 45 for Æthelberht and 9 for Archbishop Ceolnoth—and from the scale of Ceolnoth’s coinage we can presume that Canterbury remained the principal royal mint. At Rochester, as has been mentioned, the local style of die-cutting continued for a time under Æthelwulf,³ but the moneyers who survived from the DOR-B~CANT issue (namely Ethelhere and Manninc) then used dies which are difficult to distinguish from those employed by moneyers who can confidently be attributed to Canterbury. It is possible but, I think, unlikely that the Rochester mint was closed down and its moneyers transferred to Canterbury. More probably Canterbury supplied dies to the mint at Rochester.

The question arises of whether any other mints were active during this issue. The Mercian king, Burgred, is not known for the ‘open cross’ type, and there is no evidence that he had any minting rights at Rochester at this time such as his predecessor appears to have enjoyed. In fact the only coins of Burgred which can definitely be attributed to the period of the

¹ If the fragment described by C. E. Blunt in his paper “Some new Mercian coins” (BNJ XXIX, p. 10 and Pl. XV, 15) is of Berhtwulf it would add a new moneyer Beo, ... if who struck non-portrait coins from engraved dies. There is also, as Mr. Blunt pointed out, a coin of Berhtwulf with the Chi-Rho monogram on the obverse and the letter X on the reverse: the moneyer is Eanred (or, conceivably Eanbald—the coin is a fragment so the identity must remain in doubt). It is illustrated by Hawkins (Pl. VI, 85) and it is clear that the dies were made with punches. Both Eanred and Eanbald struck portrait coins for Berhtwulf.

² Professor Whitelegg has drawn my attention to Sir Frank Stenton’s suggestion, referred to by C. E. Blunt in Medieval Archaeology 1960 pp. 6–7, that the coin in question commemorated the agreement by which Berhtwulf peacefully ceded Berkshire to Æthelwulf. She suggests that this might have provided an occasion for Berhtwulf to be given minting rights in Kent.

³ See note 2 on p. 227.
'open cross' issue are the scarce 'lunette' pieces by the moneyer Tatel one of which occurred in
the Dorking hoard (cf. Pl. 22, 28, which is not the same coin). Tatel, it will be recalled, was the
moneyer of the only coin of Berhtwulf in the Dorking hoard which can be assigned to the
mint of London with any confidence, and it therefore seems likely that the activity of that
mint was at a very low level from Ecgberht's brief occupation of the city in 829 until after the
deposition of the Dorking hoard (c. 862). It does not appear probable that 'open cross' coins
in the name either of Æthelwulf or of Æthelberht could have been struck there.1 Whether
either king established a mint at Winchester, or elsewhere outside Kent, with dies supplied
from Canterbury it is impossible to say.

(b) The 'floriated cross' type c. 862–c. 866
'Open cross' gave way at Canterbury to a floriated cross (Pl. 23, 9), probably during the
latter part of Æthelberht's reign. We cannot date the transition very closely because the
Dorking hoard, buried before 'floriated cross' began and containing over 250 of his 'open
cross' coins, completely dominates the surviving material from his reign. It may be that
'floriated cross' had a very short life, but its rarity could be due, at least in part, to the change
in hoard composition that is found after 866—a subject to which I shall return.
A unique fragment of this type from the ecclesiastical mint was recorded by C. E. Blunt
in an important note in BNJ XXVIII entitled "A new type for Archbishop Ceolnoth". The
discovery of this piece, once in the Montagu collection, raises the question of the place in the
series of a coin by the moneyer Biarnred, Glasgow Sylloge no. 403 (Pl. 23, 3). The obverse
of this is of very similar style to that of the fragment already mentioned, but the reverse has
a cross crosslet with a large and a small pellet in each angle. Miss Archibald, in a recent paper
to the Royal Numismatic Society which is as yet unpublished, has cast doubt on the authen-
ticy of this coin on two counts, and I am grateful to her for writing to me to explain them.
Firstly, the portrait is drawn slightly differently than on all other full-face coins of Ceolnoth
which she has observed, in that instead of the face and chin being delineated with a continuous
curve, the continuity is from each shoulder up to the side of the face, a separate chin being
drawn. Secondly, the cross crosslet is formed by adding a cross bar at each end of a plain
cross. However, I think these points, important though they are, are insufficient of themselves
to condemn the coin. If it is a forgery it is a very clever forgery. The lettering is of the style
of the period of the 'open cross' type, in which Biarnred was a moneyer for Ceolnoth. If we
seek to place the Glasgow coin after rather than before that type we find a ready parallel for
the crosslet formation in the construction of the more complicated design of the 'floriated
cross' type. There the floral ends are joined to the ends of a plain cross in much the same way
as the crosslets on the Ceolnoth piece. If this is the right place for the coin in the series, the
method of construction of the royal crosslets at least 15 years earlier is of little relevance. It
would explain, too, why no such coin occurred in the Dorking hoard. However, the vital
question which must then be answered is why, if the coin is genuine, Biarnred was given a
reverse die which differed significantly from the true 'floriated cross' type. For the time being
the position must, I think, be left open.

(c) The 'lunette' type, discontinued c. 874
With the accession of Æthelred to the kingdom of Wessex in 866 the 'lunette' type, the
earliest representation of which is the single coin of Burgred in the Dorking hoard, became

1 See, however, the argument on p. 234.
the standard throughout south-east England. It was used by Æthelred, Alfred and Archbishop Ceolnoth, but it is the coinage of Burgred which has survived in the greatest quantity and which must have been the dominant feature of the currency of Mercia, Kent and probably Wessex at that time. This was a remarkable transformation, and we need to consider its significance.

The ‘lunette’ type in general, and Burgred’s coinage in particular, was the subject of a definitive but difficult paper by H. E. Pagan entitled “Coinage in the age of Burgred” (BNJ XXXIV, 1965). I say difficult because Mr. Pagan’s reasoning is sometimes hard to follow, and it would have been easier for the student had there been more illustrations and had they been arranged so as to demonstrate the sequence. Nevertheless the paper is of major importance, for it breaks free from the tradition of classifying the coinage solely by the form of the lunettes on which the reverse design is based. By considering in addition the portraiture, size of flan and so on a broad chronology emerges which, if the classification were defined more closely, could be more widely used in describing the coins than it is likely to be at present.

Before we look at Burgred’s own coinage, there are two groups of ‘lunette’ coins which do not involve him and for which the dies may be presumed to have been cut in Canterbury. The first is the rare ‘four-line’ variety of Æthelred, which must be the earliest of his reign (see BMC ii, Pl. IV, 4). This continues the style of portrait of Æthelberht’s ‘floriated cross’ issue (Pl. 23, 9) in the form in which one or two horizontal bars are drawn below the neck rather than two lines of three pellets. The moneyer’s name is in four lines instead of the three lines of the remainder of the ‘lunette’ issue.

The three moneyers known for the ‘four-line’ variety (two of whom were moneyers in the ‘open cross’ type) also struck the second group. This has a new portrait, with the hair confined within a curved line or bonnet, but in common with the ‘four-line’ variety the obverse inscription begins above the king’s head. The portrait on this group continues with little essential modification down to the end of the issue, with the flan size steadily diminishing. Coins of Æthelred (Pl. 23, 10) and Alfred (Pl. 23, 11) are known from hoards in moderate quantities, but those of Archbishop Ceolnoth (Pl. 23, 4) are by only two moneyers and are correspondingly rare. A coin of Ceolnoth coupling the facing bust of the ‘open cross’ and ‘floriated cross’ issues with a ‘lunette’ reverse is probably a mule (BMC 42). It is interesting to note that no ‘lunette’ coins are known of Archbishop Æthelred, who succeeded Ceolnoth on his death in 870.

If we use the BMC classification of Burgred’s ‘lunette’ coins as the standard reference for the reverses of the whole of the ‘lunette’ series (viz a = closed lunettes, b = lunettes broken by curls in the centre of each arc, c = lunettes broken by curls at the ends of the horizontal lines, d = arcs of lunettes in c omitted altogether) then the reverse dies of this second group are almost exclusively of type a. As Mr. Pagan points out, the Beeston Tor (1924) hoard, deposited very late in the issue, contained one coin of Æthelred of type d, one of Alfred of each of types b and d and three of type c, but the much larger hoards from Gravesend (1838) and Croydon (1862), deposited earlier in the issue, contained only coins of type a. Thus types b, c and d of Alfred can be regarded as late varieties.

When we come to consider Burgred’s own coinage the pattern of the reverses is different. As Mr. Pagan demonstrates, the earliest coins were of type a, but perhaps at the beginning of Æthelred’s reign there was a moderate issue of types c and d, probably in that order, followed by a very large issue of type a which seems to have continued to the end of Burgred’s reign. The second issue of type a can generally be distinguished from the first by the use of smaller
flans and by a liberal scatter of pellets in the reverse field. Type b seems to have been very limited, probably within the period of the second type a.

The obverse classification of Burgred's coinage is by no means straightforward, but there are some clear pointers. The legend beginning above the head is generally a sign of early date; if it begins by the shoulder, prefixed by a cross, the date is slightly later; thereafter the initial cross is omitted. This last group is much the largest, and has been subdivided by Mr. Pagan into two parallel series which he calls "vertical" and "horizontal". This is explicable on the basis that most dies of the former series (Pl. 23, 18-19) have a vertical headband while on dies of the latter series (Pl. 23, 29-33) the headband is tilted.

The differences between the two series—which I will refer to as Series V and Series H respectively—are easy to detect. Dies of Series V have two curls on the forehead; the wedges forming the mouth always have their points outwards; the horizontal lines on the shoulders are curved; the x in rex is generally normal and is usually followed by a dash. Dies of Series H, on the other hand, usually, have only one curl on the forehead; the wedges forming the mouth always have their points inwards; the horizontal lines on the shoulders are straight; the x in rex is generally in the form of a cross and is rarely followed by a dash.

Both series began shortly before the second reverse type a, and covered what Mr. Pagan calls the Middle and Late phases of the coinage (Middle being of reverse types c and d and Late being of reverse type a)—that is, from c. 866 to c. 874. He points out the muling between the two series, and the use by most moneyers of obverse dies of each series, and he concludes that they represent two engravers at work at one mint. So far, so good; but we are left with the problem of the coins which antedate Series V and H, which Mr. Pagan has analysed in rather less detail.

There seem in fact to be three series of coins in the Early phase, if we omit those of the moneyer Tatel which appear to follow immediately on Berhtwulf's coinage and to be associated with a mint of small size at London. Each of the three series includes coins of the moneyers Eanred and Wine, who may have been Berhtwulf's moneyers of the same names which we have linked with an engraver working at Rochester in that reign. One series, indeed, has a style of portraiture very reminiscent of that used on Berhtwulf's coins (Pl. 23, 23-28): let us therefore call it Series B. It seems to have begun when the bust broke the inscription (nos. 23-24) and to have continued into the period when the legend began by the shoulder with an initial cross (nos. 25-26), sometimes with the wedges forming the mouth omitted (nos. 27-28). Perhaps Series B was the forerunner of Series H.

Then there is the group which I will refer to as Series G, from the grotesque style of the portraiture. An example is illustrated on Plate 23, no. 21; others can be found in the Hunterian Sylloge, nos. 375, 379 and, perhaps, 376, and in the Ashmolean Sylloge, no. 29. There seem to be affinities between Series G and Series V, notably in the lettering and in the use of a dash at the end of the obverse legend. Some reverse dies have retrograde readings.

The third series in the Early phase is perhaps the most perplexing. What appear to be the earliest dies—e.g. Copenhagen Sylloge no. 63—have virtually all the appearances of Canterbury workmanship at the time of Æthelberht's "floriated cross" issue, so let me refer to this group as Series F. The double headband, the pellet-in-almond eye, the treatment of the hair, the tiny lunettes for the mouth, and the six pellets below the neck—these features are all there. The lettering is very similar, and as with "floriated cross" the inscription begins by the shoulder. The latter M for Merciorum is frequently shown. It is tempting to say, as Mr. Pagan does, that since "the imitation of these dies is as nearly photographic as an Anglo-
Saxon could make it, I think this is a consignment of dies sent from Canterbury to set London on its feet.” But there is one feature which is untypical of “floriated cross” engraving: the circle round the head is continuous, not beaded. There are, too, some minor differences in the engraving of the nose and forehead, and in the number of pellets in front of the forehead which denote hair (this seems invariably to have been three on “floriated cross” dies). If, therefore, it was the Canterbury engraver who cut these dies, why do these small discrepancies occur?

The view that the initial dies of Series F were, in fact, of Canterbury origin causes Mr. Pagan to regard as imitations dies such as that of Plate 23, no. 14 of the moneyer Liafman, which would be more happily explained as a development by the same hand, and this to my mind casts doubt on the Canterbury origin of the initial dies. The coin of Dudda (type c) illustrated as no. 4 on Mr. Pagan’s plate is another example of a supposed imitation: in this case the inscription begins above the head as on coins of Æthelred. Those shown here on Plate 23, nos. 15–17, while of much cruder style, may perhaps form a link between Series F and Series V; they have the two curls on the forehead and the curved lines on the shoulders which are typical of Series V but there are superficial resemblances to Series F also.

Does Series F give us a date for the beginning of Burgred’s main coinage? If, from the evidence of the shared moneyers, we can presume that the three series of the Early phase began at much the same time, we have a terminus post quem of c. 862/4 since it is unlikely that “floriated cross”—the prototype for Series F—came into issue before then. Even if Series B or Series G could be shown to have antedated the beginning of Series F it would be hard to take either back more than a year or two before “floriated cross”, because we are limited by the absence of all three series from the Dorking hoard, buried well into the reign of Æthelberht.

To take stock, we have distinguished three series of obverse dies in the Early phase of Burgred’s main coinage, which we have designated B, F and G. They are apparently parallel, and were used by a single group of moneyers, presumably at one mint. Reverse dies of the first type a were employed with them, and also of types c and d. Series B and Series F seem to have continued into the second type a. During the period of reverse types c and d (the Middle phase) two new series, V and H, began; these continued down to the end of the issue and were mainly associated with reverses of the second type a (the Late phase). Like the first three series, the latest two were in parallel and were employed, apparently indiscriminately, by the moneyers of the time. All five series, into which the great majority of the coins can be fitted, seem therefore to be related to one mint. It is generally assumed—and Mr. Pagan accepts the assumption—that this mint was London.

Before forming a judgment on this point it is necessary to consider the fact that fairly late in its currency the Series V engraver produced dies in the names of Æthelred and Alfred (Pl. 23, 20), frequently with blundered spellings—a feature conspicuous by its absence on his dies for Burgred. The moneyers are generally Burgred’s. Mr. Pagan suggests that these issues were irregular, and argues from the hoard evidence that those in Æthelberht’s name may have been posthumous. With these aberrations we should perhaps associate the coin in Mr. Blunt’s cabinet which purports to be of Æthelberht (illustrated in BNJ XXVII, Pl. VII, no. 8). It is very double-struck but appears to read +ÆÐÈÂÈÆÆÈHÈ; the moneyer is Dudda (type d) and the obverse has many affinities with the type c coin of Burgred, moneyer Tata (Ashmolean Sylloge no. 34, also illustrated as no. 7 on Mr. Pagan’s plate) which is from very early in Series V.
In Series H also there are coins in the names of Æthelred and Alfred, but the spelling is impeccable (Pl. 23, 34). A curious feature is that the bust breaks the inscription, as on the dies of these kings which we have already related to the Canterbury mint, but unlike the contemporary coins of Burgred. It is, I think, hard to argue in this case that Æthelred’s and Alfred’s coins are unofficial, and bearing in mind the close parallel between Series V and H in other respects this makes me uneasy about Mr. Pagan’s conclusions on the Series V coins in the names of the Wessex kings.

Nor should we ignore the fact that several moneyers of Æthelberht in the “open cross” issue have the same names as moneyers of Burgred. Two—Cenred and Ethelulf—are found in Burgred’s Early phase; three more—Dudwine, Hereferth and Wulfheard—first appear in the Middle phase; another two—Dealla and Eadulf—are only known from the Late phase, the former from coins of Series V in the name of Æthelred rather than of Burgred himself. It would be stretching coincidence too far to deny that some at least of these identities of name must represent moneyers who actually worked for Æthelberht in the “open cross” type and for Burgred in “lunette”, and I therefore think it probable, pace Mr. Pagan, that the moneyer Dudda of the “floriated cross” type is identical with Burgred’s mint of the same name and with the moneyer of the blundered “lunette” coin purporting to be of Æthelberht.

Are we, then, to postulate that Æthelberht had the use of the London mint during the “open cross” issue, to the virtual exclusion of Burgred? And that Burgred subsequently gained full control of the mint, but permitted some “lunette” coins to be struck there for the Wessex kings? We have no documentary evidence to suggest that Æthelberht and his successors had any authority in London before 886. On the other hand the documentary evidence linking Berhtwulf with Rochester is tenuous, and yet the coins suggest that he had a mint there: why not the West Saxon kings at London? Again, what significance should we attach to the similarity of coins of Series B of Burgred to those of Berhtwulf, and to the possible identity of two of the moneyers of that series with moneyers of Berhtwulf? Is there any possibility that Burgred’s mint was at Rochester, where it would be natural to find a West Saxon mint also?

These are questions which deserve further study, and it is in order to pose them that I have dealt with Burgred’s coinage in such detail. On the face of it the very scale of Burgred’s minting would seem to rule out a Mercian mint on West Saxon territory, and in favour of a West Saxon mint at London is the lead coin weight of Alfred of the “cross and lozenge” type (BMC type V) found in St. Paul’s Churchyard: the moneyer, Ealdulf, was a late moneyer of Burgred (not to be confused with Eadulf). Nevertheless I must confess to some doubt about the point in time at which a substantial mint was established in London, and how some of the self-contradictory evidence of Burgred’s coinage can be resolved.

That coinage is the commonest today of all the issues in southern England before the late tenth century. It is a poor coinage, both artistically and in its steady debasement. Its volume must reflect the need for tribute money, but as the Danes were settlers it is not found in any quantity in Scandinavia. Its impoverishment reflects the state of the Mercian and West Saxon kingdoms before the greatest of the sons of Æthelwulf turned back the Danish tide.

1 Dudda also struck for Æthelred a coin with a travesty of the normal Canterbury portrait (Ashmolean Sylloge no. 241). The same crude portrait is found on another coin of Æthelred (Reading Sylloge no. 41), this time by the moneyer Manninc, who may conceivably be identical with (or related to) the Rochester moneyer of that name in Æthelwulf’s reign.

2 See page 237 for further discussion of this point.
Hoard composition

The “open cross” type of Æthelwulf, Æthelberht and Archbishop Ceolnoth marked a new era in the history of Anglo-Saxon coinage. It is not simply that king and archbishop shared a common type: this had happened thirty years previously at the Canterbury mint in the time of Baldred and during part of Ecgberht’s reign. It is not just that, as we have seen, dies for Æthelwulf’s mint at Rochester may have ceased to be cut locally quite early in the type. It is partly the large increase in the number of moneyers, which resulted in no fewer than 45 being known to have struck the type for Æthelberht and nine for Archbishop Ceolnoth. But the really significant feature of this coinage is that, although more than 400 examples of it were found in the great Dorking hoard of 1817 and although earlier issues were present in large numbers, most subsequent hoards contain scarcely a trace of it, nor of the coinage of Berhtwulf, although there are usually a few survivors of earlier issues and a representative selection of the East Anglian coinage. The disappearance of the “open cross” type is virtually complete.

For example, the Gravesend hoard of 1838, deposited soon after Alfred’s accession and therefore within ten years of the Dorking hoard, contained nearly 500 coins of the “lunette” type, mostly of Burgred, but not a single coin of Berhtwulf, nor of the “open cross” and “floriated cross” types of the Wessex kings and Archbishop Ceolnoth. Nevertheless there were three earlier coins of Æthelwulf, two of Ceolnoth, and even one of Ceolwulf I—significantly of a lunette type—besides 50 coins of Edmund of East Anglia and seven coins of his predecessors. Again, the 1862 Croydon hoard, probably deposited a year or so later, contained 150 “lunette” coins and 24 East Anglian coins back to Athelstan I but only one Kentish coin earlier than “lunette”, namely a “second monogram” penny of Archbishop Ceolnoth.

The Beeston Tor hoard of 1924, dating from near the end of the “lunette” issue, contained only seven coins of that type and a solitary “open cross” coin of Æthelwulf: this hoard differs from the others in that no East Anglian coins were present.

It is not until we look at the enigmatic Trewhiddle hoard of 1774 that we find a significantly different pattern. Trewhiddle, like Beeston Tor, contained no East Anglian coins. Apart from the strong “lunette” content (more than half the coins in the hoard were of Burgred, but Mr. Pagan tells me he dates them not later than 868) the hoard covered the period from Coenwulf to the beginning of “open cross”: there were three of the latter, two being of Æthelwulf and one of Ceolnoth. The hoard was almost as strong in Berhtwulf (eleven coins) as in Æthelwulf (thirteen coins). It is as though it were put together in two parts, one c. 853 and the other some fifteen years later.

It seems likely that during the “lunette” issue there was a recoinage of previous issues. This may not have been intended; as the issue became more base, Gresham’s Law may have caused the earlier surviving coins to be melted down. “Lunette” itself must have been deliberately recoin, presumably by the “cross and lozenge” type, for no later hoard so far recorded seems to contain any of it and Gresham’s Law could scarcely have operated in its case.

“Floriated cross” is absent from all the hoards we have discussed. Its rarity may be a sign of its duration having been short. Alternatively it could simply be the result of our having no hoard which was deposited during its currency. Its absence from hoards of the “lunette” period cannot be adduced as evidence one way or the other.

\(^1\) Based on the reconstruction of the hoard by C. E. Blunt and R. H. M. Dolley in “The hoard evidence for the coins of Alfred” (BNJ XXIX). In passing, it is worth recording that, in their list of Burgred’s coins on pp. 226–7, the following minor errors occur in transcription from Evans’ paper in NC 1866: (18) the Evans number is 18, not 28; (54) the type is d, not e; (62) the Evans number is 23 not 2; (61) the Evans number is not 23, and unless the coin is identical with (24) it is not listed by him.
After "lunette" the next clearly substantive type is that which was shared by Alfred, Ceolwulf II of Mercia and Archbishop Æthelred of Canterbury. C. E. Blunt and R. H. M. Dolley, in their paper in Anglo-Saxon Coins on "The chronology of the coins of Ælfred the Great, 871–99", refer to it as the "Ceolwulf" type, but in considering the coinage as a whole it would make for less confusion if it were termed "cross and lozenge" after the reverse design.

An examination of the "cross and lozenge" coins leaves one in little doubt that several mints were in operation during its currency—a period which must have included Alfred's retreat into the west country. An obvious starting point for a classification is provided by the style of Archbishop Æthelred's coins (Pl. 23, 6), which is matched on coins of Alfred by several moneyers who can therefore be assigned with some confidence to Canterbury (Pl. 23, 13). This style is not found on coins of Ceolwulf. A second, and probably earlier, Canterbury group has a portrait reminiscent of the "open cross" type.¹

The portrait on another group is of a fine style which seems to portend the "London monogram" issue, and as on coins of that issue the portrait usually divides the inscription at top and bottom. Alfred and Ceolwulf shared the mint at which this group is found, and also shared at least one moneyer (Liofwald) who was a moneyer of Burgred. Ceolwulf's name is spelt with an I on coins of this group, and Alfred is usually styled simply rex as at Canterbury (Pl. 23, 37–38). A further group of Ceolwulf's is of very crude style reminiscent of Series V of Burgred, and on this group his name is spelt with an E (Plate 23, 36). Similarly for Alfred there are several different portraits, sometimes with the legend continuous from shoulder to shoulder, sometimes with it broken at the bottom by the bust, and part of the Saxoniorum title often appears (Pl. 23, 39–40). The coinage as a whole would repay detailed study, with particular reference to style of portraiture and to the ornaments in the angles of the long cross. These vary from moneyer to moneyer, and so do the ornaments in the reverse field of the non-portrait "two-line" type that seems generally to have followed it. It is possible that they are a method of identifying the mint, or some variable factor connected with minting, and a degree of correlation between the ornaments in the two types might therefore be found. I put it no higher than that.

The "two emperors" type, shared by Alfred and Ceolwulf and imitated later by Halfdene, seems to me to be earlier than "cross and lozenge". Both the known moneyers were "lunette" moneyers for Burgred, but only one is known in "cross and lozenge". It must have been a special issue, for the reverse design is surely too complicated for the wholesale production of dies (Pl. 23, 35). A mule is known which may perhaps be from an obverse die of this type: the reverse is "cross and lozenge".²

A unique coin of Archbishop Æthelred exists by the moneyer Ethered. The reverse reads ED/ER/ED/MO in the quarters of a quatrefoil, divided by a long cross over a small circle containing a cross saltire. The legend is completed in the spaces outside the quatrefoil with the letters NETA (Pl. 23, 5). The reverse type is also found on a fragment of Alfred, for which the moneyer appears to be the same, though only the letters R(?EDM are visible (Pl. 23, 12). The obverse of this fragment reads . . . EDEX. Blunt and Dolley reject, I think rightly, the alternative attribution to Burgred. They say of it that "the lettering and portrait . . . have

¹ I am indebted to Mr. Blunt for reminding me of this variety, which is exemplified by Lockett 3631.
² Illustrated in Anglo-Saxon Coins, Pl. IX, no. 3, and discussed on p. 81 where it is suggested that the obverse may be an early variety of the portrait of "cross and lozenge". I think the inclusion of an inner circle makes it more likely that the coin is a mule, but the obverse is almost certainly not from the "lunette" type.
very close parallels on certain London coins from the period c. 886”. But as Mr. Pagan has hinted in his Burgred paper, the style of engraving of the face of the portrait, particularly the eye, and of the termination of the diadem is identical with that found on coins of Æthelberht’s second type, on Æthelred’s four-line type and on Canterbury coins of the ‘lunette’ type. Furthermore the coin of Archbishop Æthelred, which has a quite different portrait, has greater stylistic affinities with the later coinage of Ceolnoth, both in the lettering and the treatment of the drapery, than with ‘cross-and-lozenge’. I think that we have here the earliest known coin of the new archbishop, that both it and the Alfred fragment are products of Canterbury, not London, and that the quatrefoil type is to be dated immediately following the lunette type, c. 875, though it evidently did not become general and should perhaps be regarded as a trial issue. It seems unlikely that the Canterbury mint would have departed from the ‘lunette’ type while other mints were still striking it for Burgred and Alfred, and it appears that Archbishop Æthelred may not have had an active mint for the first few years of his primacy. In support of this chronology is the fact that a ‘cross and lozenge’ coin of Alfred is known by the same moneyer with the normal reverse design surrounded by a quatrefoil.1 The quatrefoil became an inner circle on other Canterbury dies of the ‘cross and lozenge’ issue.

After the ‘cross and lozenge’ issue the only known coin of Archbishop Æthelred is a unique specimen in the Cuerdale hoard of the non-portrait, ‘two-line’ type. It is clear, therefore, that that type was introduced not later than 889, the year of Æthelred’s death. It was continued by his successor, Plegmund, who was the last archbishop of Canterbury to strike coins in his own name. Blunt and Dolley give a date c. 887 for the commencement of the “two-line” type, on the basis of the number of coins known of the same type but in the name of Guthrum Athelstan, who died in 890, and the likelihood that the issue post-dates Alfred’s “London monogram” coinage (Pl. 23, 41), commonly associated with his occupation of London in 886.

The “London monogram” issue marks the culmination of Alfred’s portrait coinage. Most, if not all, of the true coins of this type carry the name of a single moneyer, Tilewine, or are without a moneyer’s name—a feature which normally denotes a one-moneyer mint. This is remarkable if London was the major mint of the “lunette” and “cross and lozenge” types, but is in keeping with its exiguous existence in the second quarter of the ninth century. It would be surprising if the status of the London mint had suddenly been reduced at the time of the “monogram” issue, and indeed such a hypothesis would seem to be at variance with the fact that no fewer than seven of the moneyers of Alfred’s “two-line” type have the names of moneyers of Burgred. This is surely too high a number to be explained as sheer coincidence, and one has to ask again whether the supposition that the main mint of the last two Mercian kings was at London is tenable having regard to all the evidence. There is, too, some doubt as to how long London had been in Danish hands before Alfred occupied it in 886; presumably during that period it could not have contained a major mint whether for Ceolwulf or Alfred.2

The relationship between the “monogram” and “cross and lozenge” types merits further study. Were they issued in parallel? Why was the “monogram” type so extensively imitated in the Danelaw? Are all the coins with moneyers’ names other than Tilewine to be regarded as irregular issues, as Blunt and Dolley suggest? Above all, why did Alfred replace these portrait issues with the pedestrian non-portrait “two-line” type which was to be the foundation of the English coinage for the greater part of the tenth century?

---


2 For a discussion of the historical evidence relating to Alfred’s occupation of London see Sir
These and many other problems could scarcely have been posed but for the discovery of the vast treasure at Cuerdale in 1840. I hope to discuss this in some detail on another occasion.

Notes on the coins of Burgred and his mint illustrated on Plate 23

To save space, the reverses of the coins of Burgred and his mint, illustrated on Plate 23, nos. 14–34, have not been shown. The BMC type is indicated by the letter following the number on the plate. The reverse readings are as follows (middle line/top line/bottom line):

14. c +LIAFMA / MON / ETA
15. d CVNEHE / LMON / ETA
16. a +DIGA: / MON / ETA
17. a +HVZza / MON / 'ITH'
18. a EADNOD / 'MON' / 'ETA'
19. a BIORHOD / 'MON' / 'ETA'
20. a +TATA: / 'MON' / 'ETA'
21. c +DVDECI / IMOND / (triangle of 4 pellets) ETA
22. b VVINR / NON / ETA
23. a EANRED / MON / ETA
24. c +DVDA / MON / ETA
25. d +CIALLA / FMON / ETA
26. c DVDDA / MON / ETA
27. c EANRED / MON / ETA
28. a +CIALLA / FMON / ETA
29. d DIARVLF / MON / ETA
30. a HEAVVL / 'MON' / 'ETA'
31. a GVDHERE / 'MON' / 'ETA'
32. a BERHTE / LMON / ETA
33. a VVLFEAR / DMON / ETA
34. a BIARNRE / DMON / ETA

Nos. 20 and 34 are in the name of Alfred.